

MM93-48

From: <eruwld@exu.ericsson.se>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 11/8/95 12:56pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

NOV 9 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Walter Lee Davidson (eruwld@exu.ericsson.se) writes:

1. I am against US Gov't minimum educational content requirements.
2. I am against US Gov't "making sure that every classroom..."
3. I am against US Gov't requirements on "appropriate viewing" disclosures.
4. I am against more broadcast TV channels. Poor use of spectrum.

BTW, I live in Texas, not Sweden (.se)

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: gwa.ericsson.com
Remote IP address: 198.215.127.2

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MH 93-48

RECEIVED

From: <fsdpr@aurora.alaska.edu>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 11/8/95 5:00pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 9 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

David P. Riesz (fsdpr@aurora.alaska.edu) writes:

I feel that relying upon commercial broadcasters to provide educational and entertainment programming directed toward youth is dangerous simply because of the heavy commercial influence present on such broadcasting stations. It has been demonstrated time and again in the past twenty years how children's programming on commercial networks have been corrupted by influences of nearly every industry from breakfast cereals to action figures.

Instead of heaping hopeless policy upon commercial stations, we should invest more resources in public broadcast media, both radio and television. My own youth was influenced by such programs as "Sesame Street" and "Mr Rogers' Neighborhood" which taught me basic concepts of mathematics and the alphabet, and at the same time planted seeds which later influenced moral and social decisions I have made throughout my life.

As for public radio, there are several youth-oriented shows available, many produced by local affiliates. Also, I often hear very young callers on such talk shows as NPR's "Talk of the Nation" which discusses daily, a wide variety of social, economic, and scientific issues.

Thus, mandating children's programming on commercial networks becomes terribly redundant. Besides, what good will more such programming do when what we already have doesn't seem to be working?

Instead of trying to get kids to tune into a selection of educational programming, we need to get parents to do it for them

Kids are inherently irresponsible... everyone knows this. If we flood the television with 24-hour-a-day education, the child will wander off and find a dirty magazine or something else with which to get into trouble.

As for my own advocacy of public radio and television, I have to admit that such things have their limits.

There is a tendency, when someone reads about a new technology, for that person to believe that the new technology will solve all our woes and the world will be a better place. Phrases like "take the Information Superhighway into the 21st Century" only serve to reinforce this absurd notion. Somewhere along the way everyone got the idea that

500 channels of nonsense programming and on-line libraries will make our kids more physically fit, more intelligent, and more socially responsible. Huh?

I'm not speaking as a technophobe, either. In fact, I'm a computer science major at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. I'm surrounded by all the latest techno-goodies, which I think are absolutely cool and wonderful, but I also recognize the value of and actively participate in the world beyond my twisted-pair ethernet and television antenna.

Come on, forget the television altogether. Don't just toss about silly legislation because Clinton wants you guys to look busy. Let's actually solve something.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: nerland126a.uaforms.alaska.edu
Remote IP address: 137.229.23.50

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1

MM 93-48

From: <Petillo9@pps.duke.edu>
To: A4.A4(ssega)
Date: 11/9/95 11:48am
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

NOV 9 1995

Jay Petillo (Petillo9@pps.duke.edu) writes:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I applaud your effort to reduce children's exposure to violent and other unacceptable television programming. I am currently following the debate over the v-chip and preparing a report at Duke University. I would like to know your views on this issue and specifically how you see the implementation of the v-chip unfolding. If the broadcasters do not voluntarily comply to a rating system, what can the FCC do to enforce the ratings system devised by it's appointed advisory committee. What happens if the broadcasters still refuse to comply? What means does the FCC have for soliciting their cooperation? Are there any means to enforce their compliance. Thank you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: Remote IP address: 152.3.115.70

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM93-48

From: <clanders@huey.csun.edu>
To: A4.A4(ssega1)
Date: 11/9/95 12:28pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

RECEIVED

NOV 9 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Christopher Landers (clanders@huey.csun.edu) writes:

Dear Mr. Chairman,

I completely support your proposition to require additional childrens programming. And particularly if we're about to fundamentally change the way broadcast media are defined and divided amongst various commercial conglomerations. There is no doubt that as the traditional boundaries of technology are breached, and the regulatory restraints loosened, responsibility to the public, and children in particular, will be shuttled to the side.

I sincerely hope your efforts are successful.

Sincerely,

Christopher Landers

Art Major

Cal. State University, Northridge

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

Remote host: Remote IP address: 130.166.254.40

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM93-48

RECEIVED

NOV 9 1995

From: <pyoung@comsearch.com>

To: A4.A4(ssegal)

Date: 11/9/95 1:30pm

Subject: Chairman's Column Comment

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Peter S. Young (pyoung@comsearch.com) writes:

- 1) Making sure there is enough children's programming is good, however making sure that there is a specific amount on every broadcast station may be to restrictive or inappropriate. If a government access channel (in the event the number of channels is quadrupled) is required to show children's programs, that may be financially prohibitive. I feel that the marketplace should decide freely what it watches.
- 2) Internet access in every classroom is an ambitious goal, especially when not every home in America has a telephone. Aside from that, I am worried about the additional tax burden on the public to fund this project. Maybe one Internet PC per School...
- 3) Ratings are good, and can give parents a better idea about what children watch, however who is going to judge the programs and set up the 'definitions'? I was watching NYPD Blue the other night where they say there may be partial nudity and they had one shot where the female cop pulls off her shirt and you get a full profile of her body, breasts and all. What is the definition of partial nudity? To me that is complete nudity. I want that explained.
- 4) No opinion.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

Remote host: comsearch.com

Remote IP address: 199.100.56.3

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____